

Scott Gustin

From: Warren Spinner
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2015 2:47 PM
To: Scott Gustin
Cc: Jesse Bridges; Dan Cahill; Alicia Daniel (adaniel@uvm.edu)
Subject: RE: Electronic Copy of Tree Maintenance Plan submission?

Hi Scott,

I have reviewed the draft tree maintenance plan for the BCCH property. The plan address the forestry/tree related issues and recommends several management objectives. This area is a section of Fragmented Forest that was left as the land was developed around it over the past several years. The Greenleaf Consulting Inc. plan will be the first professional forestry management of this property. Well this plan doesn't address all of our department wishes I think it's a good start to managing the property's forest.

Other plan comments:

I was pleased to see the plans aggressive approach to managing invasive species within the forested areas. This is a department management goal for our park property as well.

In the introduction it states "A clean walkable forest with views of the lake". My thought is for the trail/paths that are eventually developed on the property would be fine and views where possible without removing several trees to accomplish it. One might interpret this to mean clean uninterrupted walking through the entire forested area. I don't think that's what the plan intends.

Hazard and dead trees in the 5 management areas – Yes it is important to remove dead and hazard trees where they can fall into a trail/path but where there is no threat to public safety I would recommend leafing some for wildlife habitat trees.

I agree with removing deadwood from the trees especially near trails and paths. I don't see why lifting or reducing trees crown's/canopy's is needed to reduce wind/sail effects. This is a forested area the trees have been working together as a group/unit for years actually protecting each other from this happening. I understand crown reduction or thinning for single or small groups of trees.

Again I'm pleased to see a management plan for this property and think it's a great start for managing this area.

Best, Warren



Warren Spinner, Certified Arborist

City Arborist

Burlington Parks, Recreation & Waterfront

645 Pine Street

Burlington, VT 05401

802-862-8245



From: Scott Gustin
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2015 8:22 AM
To: Warren Spinner
Subject: FW: Electronic Copy of Tree Maintenance Plan submission?

Good morning Warren,

Do you have any comments relative to the Eric Farrell's proposed tree maintenance plan for the former Burlington College lands? Below are comments from Dan Cahill. I'm working on the report to the DRB today.
Scott

Scott Gustin, AICP, CFM
Senior Planner
Dept. of Planning & Zoning
149 Church Street
Burlington, VT 05401
(802) 865-7189

From: Dan Cahill
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2015 1:34 PM
To: Scott Gustin <SGustin@burlingtonvt.gov>
Cc: Jesse Bridges <jbridges@burlingtonvt.gov>; Alicia Daniel <adaniel@uvm.edu>; 'Alicia Daniel' <alicia.daniel@uvm.edu>
Subject: Re: Electronic Copy of Tree Maintenance Plan submission?

Scott,

The forestry plan is a good start. However this land is a prospective future park, with significant conservation value, and therefore management and planning on and for this land should align with the City's Open Space Protection Plan. Moving forward with cutting and thinning at this time would pose significant threat to known rare and endangered species as well as wildlife habitat. The Greenleaf report is missing a full natural resource inventory and assessment, including a review and assessment of natural community types. From a conservation perspective, it is critical that we have the opportunity to perform this assessment work prior to major planned thinning and cutting.

Areas within the report where I see issues are:

- Function/goal number four on page two that states "make it a clear walk-able forest" which *not* a goal for a wildlife corridor.

There is mention of wildlife management on the same page, but nowhere in the report do I see an understanding that wildlife (foxes, rabbits, ground nesting birds, etc.) need brushy, unkempt forest floors for shelter. Most of the discussion about wildlife focuses on mast trees and snags, which are also important.

- Also from the wildlife perspective, language on page 6 paragraph 2 "tree crowns will be lifted and thinned to reduce wind 'sail,' thus minimizing the potential for wind damage." Although consideration of wind damage is

important, this analysis disregards the importance of layering in the canopy which is critical for songbird niches.

- The Greenleaf report (with its focus on trees) barely touches on the herbaceous layer. For instance, we identified Harsh Sunflower as a species of interest on the site and it does not appear in the Greenleaf report. There may well be other species of interest to the City that were not included.

In this report, the trees are described in forest stand terms, which means that there is no discussion of natural communities including, the Pine-Oak-Heath Sandplain Forest. Instead, that area is labeled Red Oak. Natural community analysis and consideration is a key element of the Open Space Protection Plan.

I propose that we begin natural resource inventory work this fall, and continue it into spring of next year. By June of 2016 an adequate natural resource inventory can be completed and a more comprehensive management protocol for the property can be adopted.

Sincerely,

Dan Cahill, CPRP
Land Steward
City of Burlington
Department of Parks Recreation
desk - 802.863-0420
fax- 802.862.8027
www.enjoyburlington.com